

**SOCIALIZATION AND INDIVIDUATION**

**MARIAN ADAMS**

## SOCIALIZATION AND INDIVIDUATION.

Marian Adams.

The object of this inquiry is to find, if possible, a basis on which the two conflicting theories of socialism and individualism, now dominating the world of social philosophy, may meet. We shall endeavor to determine how far progress is best accomplished by conserving the interests of the individual and how far <sup>by</sup> regarding the interests of society, that is to say to what extent the individual should be left free, and to what extent he should serve society.

The individualistic school maintains that social growth has been produced by the growth of the individual, the socialistic that the growth of society accounts for the enlargement of the individual life. The question for us to answer is: Can these two opposite theories be unified.

Let us first take a brief survey of the doctrines of each cult.

Mr. E. A. Ross defines individualism as "The reliance of men upon their own wisdom and strength." Its economic and political meaning is that theory of government which holds that the state should not interfere in individual affairs. The name individualism or Solipsism is sometimes given to the metaphysical doctrine that nothing exists but self. Pure individualism would imply physiological, intellectual, and moral independence.

Many writers claim that all progress and improvement in physique, intellect, and ingenuity is to be attributed to the individualistic tendency, which they say is the chief motor of modern life, and some of the foremost biologists have declared that evolution is a process of individuation.

De Tocqueville, in his "Democracy in America", characterizes



individualism as " A mature and calm feeling, which disposes each member of the community to sever himself from the mass of his fellows, and to draw apart with his family and his friends; so that, after he has thus formed a little circle of his own, he willingly leaves society at large to itself. Individualism proceeds from erroneous judgment more than from depraved feelings; it originates as much in deficiencies of mind as in perversity of heart. Individualism, at first, only saps the virtues of public life; but in the long run, it attacks and destroys all others, and is at length absorbed in downright selfishness. Individualism is of democratic origin, and it threatens to spread in the same ratio as the equality of condition."

Individualism, in particular, needs a more distinctive definition than it now has. For example, almost every important epoch of history is styled "individualistic" on some account or another. The time of the decaying Roman Empire was individualistic because public feeling was subsiding; Chivalry and Feudalism were individualistic, because people were isolated and independent; The Revival of Learning, the Renaissance, the Reformation, the rise of Guilds and Trades Unions, Puritanism, colonization, and almost every phase of development are individualistic for various and quite different reasons.

The starting-point of socialism is the conviction that the individualistic state has proved a failure. Its policy is collective control in all matters of collective concern, the equal sharing of opportunities, the more economical organization of labor through state agency, the consequent diminution of inequalities in wealth, and the removal of anxiety for material support.

Radical socialism involves the reconstruction of society, and that in a coercive, not an evolutionary manner. It thinks to change human

nature by legislation, wants to dismiss everything individual, and to transfer all responsibility from the individual to the state. It has been called the modern Tower of Babel.

Dr. Albert Schaffle, an authority on socialism says: "The economic quintessence of the socialistic programme is a method of production which would introduce a unified (social or collective) organization of national labor, on the basis of collective or common ownership of the means of production by all the members of the society. This collective method of production would remove the present competitive system, by placing under official administration such departments of production as can be managed collectively (socially or cooperatively) as well as the distribution among all of the common produce of all, according to the amount and social utility of the productive labor of each."

Karl Marx is justly called the apostle of socialism. His system is not only an economic theory, but a philosophy of human life and society. His doctrine rests not on justice or love of man, but on necessity--on the development of the forces of production which are to supersede capitalism. He denies all spirituality, and wants a better world here and now. The fundamental principle of his socialism is the materialistic conception of history, that all human institutions and beliefs are the outcome of economic conditions.

Mr. Lyman Abbot in his book "The Rights of Man" contrasts socialism and individualism, or Democracy, as he calls the latter: "Socialism seeks to change the social order without changing the individuals, democracy seeks to change the individuals that they may change the social order; socialism seeks the welfare of the individual by making him subservient to society, democracy seeks the welfare of society by making it subservient



to the individual; socialism would make society free by destroying the freedom of the individual, democracy calls on society to protect the freedom of the individual that society may be free; socialism would make the state the owner of all wealth, democracy would make the state a protector of individual industries and the state the servant of the individual; socialism puts the organization first, the individual second, democracy puts the individual first, the organization second; socialism expects to develop the individual, but chiefly through a change in the organization, democracy expects to develop society but chiefly through a change ~~in the organization~~ the development of the individual. Thus these two, working to the same ends, work by diametrically opposed methods."

The ideal of socialism, then, is the transformation of private, competing capital into united, collective capital--that of individualism is the maintenance of private competition free from state control. The extreme individualistic view as enunciated by Herbert Spencer approaches Anarchism in that it would allow no interference with the individual by the state, and would abolish the state at least as a government agency. The extreme socialistic view is virtual communism.

Having defined our terms in a general way, we will now take up each system more specifically, endeavoring to sift out the error and retain the truth.

Herbert Spencer, who may be said to have founded the individualistic school, is its most profound thinker, and its most logical and convincing advocate. He says that, in the sub-human world, progress has been possible only through unrestrained competition, and he argues that the continued development of the human race may best be secured by a like process. In applying this principle to men, however, the individual must recognize in others the right to the same activity that he desires for himself. He claims that natural selection is necessary to progress;

that stagnation of industry, mediocrity of intellect, and physical degeneration would result from attempting to shield the weak from the encroachments of the strong; that political, industrial, and moral progress has been brought about by the development of human liberty, and by subordinating the state to the individual rather than the individual to the state; that if this growth is to be continued, the individual must be left as free as is possible, and that any restraint is a backward movement. He opposes all taxation except what is necessary to secure peace and order, would reduce governmental activity to the function of police, would do away, little by little, with public education, libraries, hospitals, post offices, mints, bureaus, and fire departments. Private individuals, he says, should be left to perform all these functions.

The subordination of the welfare of the individual to that of the species, as seen in the process of evolution, cannot be defended on utilitarian grounds, since, in the unrestricted struggle for existence, nine tenths perish that the one tenth may survive. The evolutionary process, therefore, to the great majority of individuals, is oppressive and irrational.

Benjamin Kidd, in "Social Evolution", says that the process of development, helplessly submitted to by the brute creation, is, in the light of reason, seen to be irrational. When natural selection reaches rational life, it becomes subordinate to human sympathy, which is the root of morality and of organized society.

That is to say, when man becomes rational, self-conscious, and moral, his aims in life are so changed that the process of development dominant in the brute world is no longer sufficient. There comes to the self-conscious individual the idea of possible personal perfection and of a happier and better life than mere existence. Social progress thus



points to a time when the fittest to survive will be those who are, as Huxley says, ethically the best. Reason added to self-consciousness, suggests that man may take steps to realize his ideals, by supplanting the slow and expensive method of biology by processes in which the law of evolution, when it causes unnecessary waste and suffering, should be checked.

In this connection, Mr. Huxley says: "Men in society are undoubtedly subject to the cosmic process. The struggle for existence tends to eliminate those less fitted to adapt themselves to the circumstances of their existence; the strongest, the most self-assertive, tend to break down the weaker..... Social progress means a checking of the cosmic process at every step, and the substitution for it of another, which may be called the ethical process, the end of which is not the survival of those who may happen to be the fittest, in respect of the whole of the conditions which obtain, but of those who are ethically the best. The practice of that which is ethically best- what we call goodness or virtue- involves a course of conduct which in all respects is opposed to that which leads to success in the cosmic struggle for existence. In place of ruthless self-assertion, it demands self-restraint, in place of thrusting aside or treading down all competitors, it requires that the individual shall not merely respect, but shall help his fellows; its influence is directed not so much to the survival of the fittest as to the fitting of as many as possible to survive..... Laws and moral precepts are directed to the end of curbing the cosmic process and reminding the individual of his duty to the community, to the protection and influence of which he owes, if not existence itself, at least the life of something better than a brutal savage."

But is not the "ethical process" a part of the great "cosmic process" which takes a different form in the human from what it has taken in the lower animal world. Competition is not checked but the struggle is no longer for life, a different criteria being developed. The struggle for existence means the adaptation of oneself to environment. In this connection it is interesting to note that many common altruistic acts are socially beneficial. Dr. Dewey says: "In caring for the sick or helpless we develop habits of foresight and forethought, powers of looking before and after, tendencies to husband our means, which ultimately make us the most skillful in warfare. We foster habits of group-loyalty, which binds together by such close ties that no social group which has not cultivated like feelings, though caring for all its members, will be able to withstand us. In a word, such conduct would pay in the struggle for existence as well as be morally commendable."

This goes to prove that the ethical process is included in the cosmic process, and to disprove Mr. Spencer's idea that an interference with competition is an interference with nature-- with the cosmic process.

The question is can natural laws be interfered with. May the so-called interference not be a part of the full development of the law? If, as Mr. Spencer holds, the militant regime makes way for the industrial regime, may not government, following suit, pass from the militant to the industrial? Mr. Spencer himself says that human society is in process of evolution towards a state in which the individual will have adapted himself perfectly to social needs, and each will contribute to the happiness of all.

Mr. Kidd in his "Social Evolution" accepts Mr. Spencer's application of the evolutionary law to man, and condemns socialistic schemes as fundamentally defective because they would attempt to check the operation



of law. He would remove all hindrances to competition. He says the problem is to secure such a condition that all may enter into competition on a footing of equality of opportunity, retaining enough inequality to keep alive stress and exertion necessary to efficiency. He makes the statement that race and individual interests are irreconcilable. His error lies in considering competition little more than a struggle for existence.

Mr. Kidd is correct in maintaining that a condition of absolute competition would be ideal, and with a more perfect industrial organization such a condition might be approximated. If so, it would certainly not be impossible to secure individual welfare. Under such conditions, no one could be hindered from developing his powers and reaping the reward of his efforts. Of course it is to be understood that the competition must be maintained on high planes. Putting this construction on the matter, we can agree fully with Mr. Spencer that "the interests of humanity are to be best subserved by giving full freedom to the law that each individual shall receive the benefits and evils of his own nature and its consequent conduct." We differ from him in regard to the extent of social control;; we would increase the educative and regulative powers of the state. ;

Under modern conditions, combinations are undoubtedly superior, in economy and efficiency, to smaller rivals, and tend, not to free competition, but to monopoly. The combinations of industry and commerce have now reached such a state of development that mocks at former advocates of uncontrolled competition.

The Standard Oil Trust, organized in 1882, was the first to gain a complete monopoly, and that by illegal processes, if one half of what is charged to it be true. Since its formation, similar combinations of capital have increased rapidly in the United States, England, and Europe.

It was asserted that only such organizations as had natural monopolies could be successful, and that even in this case, they could not raise prices-- with what grounds the event has proved. Concessions were granted to rival companies, it being thought that competition would cheapen products. The plan has proven a delusion and a snare, for, under these conditions, competition did not long hold out. The companies provided themselves with charters and then united. So far, the effort to control the trusts by legal enactments has been to no purpose, for in spite of legislation capital has combined and concentrated steadily, until from combinations representing millions, we have those whose capital amounts to hundreds of millions, and still the aggregation goes on. They influence national and international affairs. It was said that "The petitions, prayers, protestations, and profanity of sixty millions of people are not as strong to control legislation as the influence and effort of the head of a single combine with fifty millions of dollars at his back". What chance has the individual under these conditions?

The result of the struggle is that a few of the most unscrupulous gain enormous fortunes, and even if the owner of a fortune disposes of it for public benefit, he is only dispensing charity on a large scale, and charity accepted by society will have analagous effects to those produced by charity to the individual. Degeneration is the inevitable result if the practice is continued.

Such is the commercial and industrial situation today, and the doctrine of Laissez-faire, that all such evils are self curative if left alone, is being seriously questioned. It seems that only the will of the general public, awakened to responsibility and to the principles involved could hold the arena of competition free and open. This is the argument which gives the theories of public ownership of the instruments



and materials of production, freed from all crude revolutionary ideas of confiscation and regimentation, their enduring strength.

Free competition is the goal toward which we move, but to make this possible, equal economic opportunity is necessary. State organization under general direction and responsibility, tending to free and unhampered competition and not to fixity is not a Utopian dream. It is the goal which Spencer saw, approached by a different way, for the world has moved nearer since his day, and the perspective of approach is clearer. It was perhaps necessary to go through the present phase of competition, and the new system must supersede the old by pure merit, not by force.

The struggle for existence, then, is an insufficient philosophy for human life. It is a veritable scramble for subsistence, the state being allotted the task of keeping order among competitors, and it confounds animal growth with social development. This theory would teach us that as in animal and plant life, so in human life, only a privileged few can continue to flourish, develop to full age, and attain their goal; the great mass must starve and prematurely perish. Such a doctrine is the extreme of pessimism for all except the favored few.

Mr. Giddings, in his "Democracy and Empire" takes the same view of the matter. He says: "Competition is found to be a vastly more tremendous force than could have been dreamed of, but it works with ruinous irregularity and inequality, reducing service almost to a gratuity in one place, while failing to reduce excessive charges in another. Shall these evils be left to correct themselves if they will, or shall the state attempt to correct them, and if so, how? The first of these questions has been answered for at least the time being. Faith in a self-correcting virtue has died out, state action has begun, and its continuance is inevitable. There are two forms it can take, namely, state ownership and state regulation. It is held by many economists that a business which is



by its nature a monopoly is properly a function of government, while business that is self-regulated by competition is properly a function of individuals."

"Men are willing that life should be a race", says Mr. Ross in "Social Control", "But what kind of a race is it when some must run while others have the prizes without running at all..... If, however, society were to deny the power of bequest, it would dash upon another difficulty. It would exasperate the strong who feel they have a right out of their success to shield their children from the struggle for existence. For what kind of a victory is it if the winner may not share the prize with his own flesh and blood? The private ownership of income-producing property such as land and capital, forces society upon another dilemma. Men are willing to be beaten in a "square" race, but how if some must run on foot, while the prizes are snatched by those having bicycles or auto-cars? But if to appease them society should manage productive wealth for the common benefit, it would antagonize the strong, who feel that it is perfectly fair to use their winnings in one competition to insure their success in the next. It is undeniable that the actual competitive regime was never devised by the sense of justice".

Prof. Pearson asks: "Is it better to have a few prize cattle among innumerable lean kine than to have a decently bred and properly fed herd"?

The regulative power of the state could be used to secure the freest and fullest competition along the highest lines, by maintaining proper hours of work, hygienic conditions, regulating the employment of women and children, and in filling the function of education, which can be made to provide free and adequate instruction in all forms of knowledge. It is held by some that such activities are not socialistic, because if not performed by the state they cannot be properly performed by individuals.



We again quote from Mr. Gidding's work on this point: "There is a distinction to be made between the state action that simultaneously increases social burdens and diminishes the power of the people to bear them, and the state action that diminishes social burdens and develops individual energies. The latter is not socialistic but societarian. It recognizes the state and the individual as coordinate powers, and brings them into cooperation to their mutual advantage, aiming to make society serve its individual members, and to make individuals better members of society. Socialism recognizes only the social aggregate, the mass, and represses the individual; while, on the contrary, societarian action, reciprocal service between society and its individual members, is a process of the highest social evolution, and the chief agency in helping the poor to grow richer by their own endeavors".

Mr. Willoughby says in "The Nature of the State": "There are duties not essential to the states existence, and yet, from their very nature, not likely or even possible of performance by private parties. Such duties as these are, therefore, not socialistic, because their public assumption does not limit the field of private enterprise, nor in any way interfere with private management of any sort of industry. As a rule they are powers educational in character rather than coercive, directive rather than controlling. Under this head come all those administrative duties that are of an investigating, statistical character, and consist not in the interference with industry, but in the study of conditions and the diffusion of the information thus obtained. Work of this kind is that performed by the United States Department of Labor and Agriculture, by the Bureau of Education, the Fish Commission, The Coast and Geodetic Survey, by the Census Bureau, etc. Public libraries and reading rooms, boards of health, the provision of public parks, and certain branches of

education also come under this head. Their purpose is not to interfere with the struggle for existence and the survival of the fittest, but to transform the environment, and, by diffusing sounder information concerning the character of the conditions and the nature of the forces by which man is surrounded, to render it possible for him either to harmonize his efforts with them or to direct his strength and intelligence to a modification of them, in fine to increase his opportunities".

The state management of an industry which would, if left in private hands, be swallowed up in one of the combines, will rather conserve than check competition, by giving all the benefit of the monopoly, but such a course would not be justified until every hope of controlling it to secure healthy competition is exhausted. An industry tends to monopoly when there is an economy in consolidating the plant. The opinion that such industries should be either owned or regulated by the government is widespread, but there is much disagreement as to which plan would be best.

Government ownership would certainly involve great dangers and risks. It might not stop with those industries tending to monopoly. Besides there would be great political difficulties, since it would mean a vast extension of civil service, with all its liability to corruption.

Again, if there was no competition in the sense of rewards for achievement, there can be no doubt but that art, invention, science, production, and ability would all languish and decay. Government must protect men in the enjoyment of the fruits of their labor and genius, or the incentive to effort will be destroyed.

Mr. Lane tries to solve some of these problems in his book "The Level of Social Motion". He says:- "As the diffusion of wealth progresses, government areas of capital expand, and so long as diffusion advances, government must take over increasingly large areas of capital, over which



it can be found to exercise control. To this action there must be some end. It cannot go on forever. Where, then, must it stop? Where, if not at that point at which government has united with all the capital with which it can unite? When this point is reached, economic social forces will be in equilibrium and not before. And what force is it that alone can determine when this state has been reached? Is it not the perception that there can be no further diffusion of wealth by government action? Is it not clear that when government interference with capital would serve only to hinder rather than help, the very process which would be most ~~des~~ desired of all, government interference would stop of its own force? No mysterious power of intellect is needed to say whether any particular kind of production is capable of socialization or not--the proof is in the actual socialization of all kinds of capital susceptible to this method".

Summing up the points wherein we differ from Mr. Spencer and the individualistic school in the application of the competitive system, we would advocate state intervention in the following cases:

(1) When it is educative , or performs other functions which would not otherwise be performed.

(2) When it promotes a higher form of competition than could exist under private monopoly.

(3) When it prevents oppression and strife between individuals.

We contend that, in order to protect society from lawless, indolent, rapacious, and overgrown private interests, the administrative power of the state must be developed.

-oOo-

We must next direct our inquiries towards the opposing theory.

Probably no individualist would hold that all property should be owned by private individuals--they could not object, for instance, to public ownership of the streets of a city; neither would the most radical communist dare to assert that there should be no articles of private property, and of course the usual demand of the socialist is only that the instruments of production be commonly owned. The problem, then, is to determine what property should be public and what private, and the two main considerations seem to be productive efficiency and distributive justice, because the greater the wealth of a community, the more opportunity there is for the culture and ethical development leading to the higher individualism.

Let us look into the doctrine of equality, and see how far it will bear investigation.

While all men are not equally fit for every occupation, all have ability in some way, and it is probable that if they were freed from the fear of failure to make a livelihood, and were given opportunities for the selection of an occupation in youth, the great majority would choose that for which they are best adapted. As things now stand, natural selection seems to force and keep persons in uncongenial occupations.

Proudhon advocates equality of wage as an ideal, though he recognizes great differences in both mental and physical abilities, but he says that special talents should confer no privilege, because genius is created by society rather than being a gift from nature, and the more knowledge and ability a man has, the greater his debt; furthermore, that there is no comparison for capacity, inequality being simply specialty of talent. He therefore thinks that society has the right to demand from each individual according to his capacity, and that each having thus contributed, all deserve and should be rewarded equally.



The chief defect in this argument is the assumption that differences in talent are due entirely to social forces. Again, while he thinks the share of the lazy should be reduced, he denies increased reward to diligence and faithfulness.

Godwin bases his doctrine of equality on the idea that needs should govern distribution, and that in a well-ordered society, wants would be nearly equal.

This argument is of little value, since the differences in conditions of time, place, purposes, capacities, and dispositions, all combine to vary the amount which different individuals might justly demand.

Some of the objections to a communistic regime are given in the following quotation from an essay by John Stuart Mill:- "It is a simple rule, and under certain aspects a just one, to give equal payment to all who share in the work. But this is a very imperfect justice unless the work also is apportioned equally. Now the many different kinds of work required in every society are very unequal in hardness and unpleasantness. To measure these against each other, so as to make quality equivalent to quantity is so difficult that communists generally propose that all should work by turns at every kind of labor. But this involves an almost complete sacrifice of the economic advantages of the division of employments.....Further it is still a very imperfect standard of justice to demand the same amount of work from every one. People have unequal capacities for work, both mental and bodily, and what is a light task for one is an insupportable burden to another"

Other difficulties ~~would~~ which would present themselves; people cut off from economic inequalities might be rivals in personal power and influence; the higher forms of activity, requiring greater exertion, might fail through lack of stimulus or encouragement; monotony and passivity would be apt to attend a scheme of the kind, also over-increase of population.

However, in making a comparison between what life under average Utopian ideals would be, and that with which we are acquainted, we should take into consideration the gray monotony of the working man's life today, broken now and then by the fear and worry of non-employment. To make up the average, the life of the favored should be replete with interest and enjoyment; instead it has become almost an axiom that the cares of the millionaire increase with his wealth.

Mill makes the following declaration in his Political Economy:- "If the choice were to be made between communism with all its chances, and the present state of society with all its sufferings and injustices, if the institution of private property necessarily carried with it, as a consequence, that the produce of labor should be apportioned as we now see it, almost in an inverse ratio to the labor--the largest portions to those who have not worked at all, the next largest to those whose work is almost nominal, and so in descending scale, the remuneration dwindling as the work grows harder and more disagreeable, until the most fatiguing and exhausting bodily labor cannot count with certainty on being able to earn even the necessities of life--if this, or communism, were the alternative, all the difficulties, great or small, of communism would be but as dust on the balance. But to make the comparison applicable, we must compare communism at its best with the regime of individual property, not as it is, but as it might be made. The principle of private property has never yet had a fair trial in any country".

Adam Smith, in his "Wealth of Nations" says: "The difference of natural talents in different men is, in reality, much less than we are aware of, and the very different genius which appears to distinguish men of different professions, when grown up to maturity, is not upon many occasions so much the cause as the effect of the division of labor. The



difference between the most dissimilar characters, between a philosopher and a common street porter, for example, seems to arise, not so much from nature as from habit, custom, and education".

The important truth is that all men are alike rational, moral beings, all having at least potential powers, and being thus fundamentally equal, it would seem to follow that a perfect system would give all a chance for cultivation and development. ✎

Does the fact of natural inequalities obligate the more favored to try to correct the disadvantages under which the more fortunate labor? It could not be asked that inequalities due to causes that might have been controlled should be corrected, but only those due to uncontrollable circumstances. Neither could the advantages which one has obtained lawfully and through his own efforts, be seized upon by others.

The doctrine of absolute economic equality, then, must be repudiated:

(1) Because the same amount of goods will have a different value for different individuals.

(2) Because individual merit must not be disregarded.

(3) Only <sup>^</sup>natural and unmerited inequalities can or should be leveled, the others being inherent and often beneficial.

While an ideal condition would not promote wide social extremes, therefore, it would by no means result in a condition of social equality. Equal opportunity is the only sound theory. Let men start even--they will by no means end alike.

-oOo-

It now remains to be seen if there is not a meeting ground for both theories. In the past, humanity has never been entirely controlled by either the socialistic or the individualistic thought. The two principles

have blended throughout human history. Mankind must go on evolving, and probably on lines that have already been tried. Complete individualism is not possible, and normal man does not desire it, for the social instinct is universal. The normal ~~xxxxxxxxxxxx~~ condition is a measureable individualism in a necessary socialism--the individual living in and profiting by the social state.

Both theories have a justification in that they exist as tendencies in human development, varying in force at different times. At present ~~th~~ there is a great drift toward the socialistic thought, that is toward some expansion of government powers, although the name of "socialist" is not assumed by many of the more moderate and thoughtful minds because they regard the communistic ideal, which appeals to many, as being totally undesirable and irrational. The way to Utopia, according to this more moderate view, is through moral improvement, and what is called the higher individualism, or the education of the individual mind and conscience. The socialist feels that steps in the direction of governmental expansion will be so successful that the opposition to state production ~~will~~ will gradually wear away, but the probability is that the amount of desirable state control is limited, and it may be that a reactionary tendency or movement toward individualism will shortly be felt. It is certain that human progress has not been and will not be along one single line for any considerable length of time, though the extremists ~~mon~~ both sides may not admit the fact. Mankind is influenced by many forces, and progress comes from free and full discussion of diverse views.

We are beginning to see that the welfare of all is of prime importance, and the idea that ~~one's~~ one's whole duty lies in looking after his individual good is bound to give place for a broader conception.

The socialistic movement penetrates everywhere--no form of government, neither Imperial Germany, Republican France, Constitutional England



autocratic Russia, nor Democratic America is exempt. A complete change of attitude toward the state is noticeable--from being regarded with suspicion, it is now looked on with hope. If the drift of society is really toward socialism, and if, as appears, the movement is universal, there must be a universal cause for it. Is it not possible that natural evolution now points in this direction?

All kinds of speculations are being made as to the nature of the future state, most of which we can readily see are Utopian. The trouble is that the majority of the socialistic schemes are simple, while society is a "great moving mass of living matter of bewildering complexity of power and action". Then the socialists are too impatient. They expect results at once. Although the action of society, compared with other natural processes, is very rapid, it has taken four thousand years to completely alter it.

Much of the reasoning of socialists is from narrow premises, and their conclusions are often absurd. The movement as a whole, however, indicates growth, not decay. The measure of socialism which has been tried in American institutions has stood the test, but the greater part of so-called socialism is still theoretical. The public school system is the most notable example of successful state control, very little being heard of its interference with individual freedom. The public library seems also to dodge the criticism of the individualist. In fact, there is a balance, unconscious it may be, between socialistic and individualistic conceptions--a feeling for reform, which some call opportunism.

Mr. Kidd has changed his attitude toward socialism since he wrote his "Social Evolution". In his later work "Western Civilization" he compares the movement of modern socialism to the Renaissance of the middle ages, out of which arose new principles and processes of evolution. He

says that though the leaders of socialism have sometimes missed the essential meaning of our era, the movement nevertheless truly represents a general revolt against economic conditions tending toward absolutism. It expresses the first general effort of the masses to change economic conditions from the early conception of competition. "From far beyond the early mists of human history", he says, "we see the workings of that stage of social development in which the subordination of the individual to organized society is being effected". He explains that there must now be developed the higher type of social efficiency, the life principle of which is that the interests of the existing social order must be subordinate to interests of future times and to future social organizations. He says that the clue to individual and social development alike is in the relations of the ascendant present to the past.

The gist of his theory is summed up in the following:- "We are living in the midst of a movement in which there runs through the whole realm of art, of ethics, of literature, of philosophy, of religion, of politics, and of economics, the deep cosmic note of a struggle in which the individual and society are being slowly broken to the ends of a social efficiency which can nevermore be included within the limits of political consciousness. We perceive the central meaning of that era to be that it is the period in which the present is passing out under the control of the infinite. The central meaning of the evolutionary drama has been missed in the conception that there is nothing in the human mind but what is related to past experience, and that there is nothing in the theory of social progress but what is related to the interests of the individuals comprised within the limits of political consciousness".

Again he says:- "German idealism struggled for one hundred and fifty years to bring to birth in coherent utterance that the history of the world is the history of the ideas by which the subordination of the



individual to a world-process infinite in its meaning has been effected".

Mr. Ross, in his book "Social Control", takes the middle view. He says that social power is concentrated or diffused in proportion as men do or do not feel themselves in need of guidance or protection. The mass has in turn transferred its allegiance from elders to priests, from priests to the military caste, or to savants, prestige being the cause of its location. Thus the prestige of prowess gives power to the military class--the prestige of money gives it to the capitalists. But when the many begin to feel their own strength, wisdom, and ability to cope with evils, they resume control, and the few cease to monopolize power.

A man naturally prefers to do as he pleases, not as society pleases to have him do, and when social power comes to reside largely in the mass of people whose necks are galled by social requirement, the more the yoke of the law will be lightened. Hitherto, those who applied social pressure were more distinct from those who bore it, and regulation was laid on lavishly. Thus he reaches the law that the volume of social requirement will be greater when social power is concentrated than when it is diffused.

It is true that when laws are framed by the few they may be either far in advance or far behind the majority. When the few who control live at the expense of the rest, we have a parasitic class. Slavery was the earliest form of an exploited class, which later became modified into serfdom. Then taxation became the means of securing goods for the parasitic class. Finally, the latter is able to live in idleness by monopolizing land or some other natural means of production, thus substituting what Mr. Ross calls "A refined and slanting kind of exploitation" for the coarse and direct kinds. In this process, many personal rights of the exploited come to be recognized. While the slave has no

rights at all, the serf directs his own labor, but is bound to the land. The peasant is free to work and to go where he wishes, but has no voice in the spending of the taxes he pays. Later, the exploited class comes to have as many personal rights as the exploiter, but must respect his rights of ownership.

The middle course is one which will not try to hold the state back from a field which it can operate better than private individuals, and will not prevent individuals from the exercise of ability and talent in any lawful enterprise. It is a system of checks and balances.

More rapid progress may be confidently looked for in the future, but it will not be at right angles with the line in which past development has been accomplished. Evolution comes little by little.

Matthew Arnold says:- "Socialism will not prevail. No more will a narrow individualism be the heir of all the ages. Undivided and inseparable, society and the individual will respect each others rights and functions, increase their attention to their diverse duties, and steadily lift mankind into more resolute life".

Prof. Pearson:- "I fancy science will ultimately balance the individualistic and socialistic tendencies in evolution better than Haeckel and Spencer seem to have done. The power of the individualistic formula to describe human growth has been over-rated, and the evolutionary origin of the socialistic instinct has been frequently overlooked. In the face of the severe struggle, physical and commercial, the fight for land, for food, and for mineral wealth between existing nations, we have every need to strengthen by training the socialistic spirit, if we, as a nation, are to be among the surviving fit. The importance of organizing society, of making the individual subservient to the whole, grows with the intensity of the struggle. A nation needs not only a few prize individuals, it needs a finely regulated social system-- of which the members as



whole, respond to each external stress by organization--if it is to survive in the struggle for existence".

His theory is that progress now depends on limiting the competition in the society, in the interest of successful competition with other societies. Social cohesion, he says, is of the greatest importance because of the struggle raging between modern nations. "The development of the individual", he continues, "a product of the struggle of man against man, is seen to be controlled by the organization of the social unit, a product of the struggle of society against society. The development of the individual society is again influenced, if to a less extent, by the instinct of a human solidarity in civilized mankind, a product of the struggle of civilization against barbarism and against inorganic and organic nature."

Giddings:- "While a too radical individualism would remove all restraints upon intra-group competition, ignoring the perils of the extra-group struggle, socialism, in view of extra-group competition would suppress the competition between individuals and classes. The common sense of mankind has always seen that either of these extreme policies would be disastrous. A measure of intra-group competition and natural selection is necessary for progress; but social cohesion is no less necessary for success in the world struggle. A sound social policy, therefore, always endeavors to maintain social cohesion with a minimum restriction of individual liberty".

Some writers hold with Pearson that the evolution is from individualism to socialism and then to human solidarity or humanism. There seems, however, to be no good reason for thinking that the separate or distributive phase of life is more primary or basic than the collective. It is probably so regarded because the individual life is tangible, while the life of society is only realized through the imagination.

It is probably no more true that individuals make ~~xx~~ society than that society makes individuals, though the latter idea is not so common. The conception that individuality is a precedent and lower moral phase than society makes progress consist in merging the individual into the social. The sounder view is that the two are co-existent and of equal moral rank, being complements of each other. Progress is not from one to the other, but from lower ~~to~~ higher forms of both.

Society cannot be regarded as something separate from individuals which make society--there is in reality no difference between them. A complete view of all the individuals would be a complete view of the society. Is it not, then, a fallacy to speak of social and individual interests as different or antagonistic? Are not these opposing tendencies more in theory than in actuality? In practice, the individual surrenders to the state when it is better for him to do so, and the state likewise gives way to the individual when that is best, thus establishing an equilibrium between the two. One fully aware of this fact will see that an injury to society is an injury to himself, that showing justice to others is only being just to himself. One has most liberty when that liberty is for all alike.

Spencer says that social interests pass out from under the control of the past towards an organization of society in which a conciliation is to take place between the interests of each and the interests of all.

Willoughby:- "The highest good, at least as men are now constituted, is a social one. For its attainment, the maintenance of social relations is necessary--so necessary in fact that the individual is able to find his best self realization only when he seeks his own good in the good of others and of society at large".

J. S. Mill stands for conciliation. His conception is that the science of the state is the science of society. He considers the ideal



of the highest social good to be the same thing as the highest good of the individuals; he therefore thinks the main duty of the individual is to watch and influence the tendencies of government, and holds that the end of human effort should be to bring about the conciliation between the individual and society. He says in his "Utilitarianism": "Laws and social arrangements should place the interests of every individual as nearly as possible in harmony with the interests of the whole". The whole social process is summed up by him as a movement towards an ideal in which the interests of society shall be brought into harmony with the enlightened self-interest of all the individuals of the state.

Individualism, alone, cannot claim to be the ultimate principle of progress, for society is greater than the individual. The phase of development now inaugurated is above everything else a process of advancement toward higher social efficiency, in which the individual has ceased to be of the first importance.

Edmund Burke said: "Society is, indeed, a contract. Subordinate contracts for objects of mere occasional interest may be dissolved at pleasure; but the state ought not to be considered as nothing better than a partnership agreement in a trade of pepper and coffee, calico or tobacco or some other such low concern, to be taken up for a little temporary interest, and to be dissolved by the fancy of the parties. It is to be looked on with reverence, because it is not a partnership in things subservient only to the gross animal existence of a temporary and perishable nature. It is a partnership in all science, a partnership in all art, a partnership in every virtue and in all perfection. As the ends of such a partnership cannot be obtained in many generations, it becomes a partnership between those who are living and those who are dead, and those who are to be born".

Before closing the discussion, there is one final point to be settled. As civilization advances, and ignorance and vice decline, will the need for state intervention disappear?

Prof. Freeman holds that the existence of government is a sign of man's imperfection, and that the ideal form of government is no government at all. Mr. Spencer says that government is natural to one phase of development, and that it is a mistake to assume that it will last. It exists, he asserts, because crime exists, and when crime disappears, will be no longer necessary.

The truth is that the ideal social order will do away with government in the sense of coercion, but not in the sense of forms of public activity. The absence of coercion, however, would not necessarily mean the doing away with all regulations, for if such were acknowledged to be just, there would be no feeling of coercion in following them. Forms of public activity would on the contrary be very apt to be much extended in a society where all were trustworthy and intelligent, because of the economy in production that could be effected. The punitive activity would fall into disuse, likewise the civil and criminal litigation. Probably only the administrative function would remain, increased to include all services which could be better performed singly than separately.

The ideal toward which we are advancing is a fair and open competition, in which the best skill, abilities, methods, and standards will receive recognition. It looks forward to universal opportunity of all individuals of every land. The destined system of the world reveals in its complex essence two tendencies, apparently, but not really, opposed, socialism, held in solution with individualism. A mighty readjustment of society is coming, though what can now be seen is only a dim promise of reformation which may take centuries to complete.





3 1114 03318 1829

HQ  
5.5  
1903  
A3

Adams.

University  
ArchivesThesis 1903.  
Socialization and  
individuation.

DATE

ISSUED TO

HQ  
5.5  
1903  
A3

